

CAREER SERVICE PANEL
Minutes of the Meeting
11 December 1972

25X1

Attendees:

Dr. Sayre Stevens, D/ORD

Chairman

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

Executive Secretary

25X1A9A

Recording Secretary

Absentees:

25X1A9A

1. The meeting was called to order by the Chairman at 0920 hours.

2. There were no changes or additions to the agenda for 11 December 1972.

3. [] moved to approve the minutes for 6 November 1972 as written. [] seconded the motion. The CSP members present concurred with the motion.

4. [] made the following report:

PROMOTIONS : None

ADDITIONS : None

REASSIGNMENTS : None

RESIGNATIONS : None

RETIREMENT :

[] C/BSD/ORD, GS-15, retired on 20 November 1972.

QSIs : None

25X1

25X1

15 December 1972

4. (Continued)

TRAINING NOTES:

a. There were no nominees from ORD for:

- (1) Carnegie-Mellon University
Program for Executives
21 - 23 March 1973
- (2) Princeton University
Educational Program for Federal Officials
at Mid-Career - 1973 - 1974

b. ORD will probably be receiving a request for a nominee to the Naval War College sometime in January or February.

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

5. [] stated that ORD has never been able to send their people to the Naval War College. He stated that efforts had been made to send []

25X1A9A

[] stated that if the CSP/ORD members felt the course was worthwhile ORD should look for a way to identify a nominee for the course. [] felt that this might be a point to discuss with Dr. Stevens when he joined the meeting.

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

6. [] reported to the Panel that the ORD/CSP Charter had been signed by Dr. Stevens. He stated that Dr. Stevens would make known his views on the membership composition of the Panel, particularly the attendance of deputy chiefs and younger professional men as based on his experience with OSI. [] asked [] if such a change in membership composition would hold true on the Senior Career Board/DD/S&T. This information was not available.

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

7. CSP/ORD members present at the meeting concurred that [] GS-13, DS&P/ORD would be recommended to the D/ORD as a nominee for the Midcareer Executive Development Course running from 28 January - 9 March 1973.

25X1A9A

8. Dr. Stevens joined the meeting at 0935 hours. [] stated that the CSP members would like to hear his views on how he, as D/ORD, would like to have the CSP function in support of what he is trying to do for ORD, and how did he want the CSP to carry out its mission. [] continued with the following questions: Do you want the ORD/CSP to be a "promotion" board, or do you want the ORD/CSP to be a management board concerned with the broadest of career development?

25X1A9A

9. Dr. Stevens:

I certainly am in favor of the CSP playing a significant role in matters of promotions, training, and standard things. Beyond that, however, I think they should be considering other personnel actions where ORD needs to look at the Office reserve as a whole. For example, the business of finding a man to send to FBIS. The CSP should consider questions like this and come up with proposals. The CSP should take a look at the broader question of what should ORD do about career development. This poses a particular problem in ORD. CSP/ORD should provide a means where a man in ORD can get away to training or get experience in other Directorates to improve his capabilities. There is no regular system to do this. The need is very well recognized.

I think the whole question of ratings, not only the rating done within the Panel, but also the ratings done on the fitness reports should be studied. The CSP ought to consider how the employee is to be told where he stands and how we let the employee know where he stands. My experience with OSI fitness reports is that very serious questions arise from these reports. Sometimes fitness reports are written in exactly the same terms for an employee getting a promotion as for a man you want to "fire." Though the difference in standing between the two employees is obvious when you are part of the management cycle, it may not be evident to the two employees. In OSI there were actual cases of people coming up to get a promotion who thought they were going to be "fired." There were other people who were brought in to be told that they were "fired," and they were horrified because they thought they were getting a promotion. It seems to signify that decisions on promotions or training of these individuals are not made on the basis of the fitness reports. An employee only knows what he sees on the fitness report. It is also true that you find yourself preparing a fitness report without sitting down and spending some time with the employee and discussing the problems as you should. Personnel problems are not major in ORD according to the IG report. That is the best thing I have to go on. I have not been too involved in personnel actions to date. There is no suggestion in the IG report that there is dissension among the "troops," or that there is a widespread feeling of being abused. Another thing to the CSP's credit is that while the IG found a number of things to complain about the CSP and the way it operated, it stated that in every single case the Panel was aware of the problems and had taken steps to straighten out the situation, and new approaches had been taken.

9. Dr. Stevens: (Continued)

Then, there was the question of membership of the CSP as outlined in the new ORD/CSP Charter. By the way, one thing I would like to have done - I would like to see the minutes of the meeting. On the question of the Charter, I thought that it looked fine. I raised the question on Deputy Chiefs sitting in on the meetings -- I have no quarrel with that. However, a point needs to be made and that is there are younger employees who have a real problem understanding the way the CSP process works and how it makes its ratings. In the OSI, the CSP consisted of Division Chiefs, Chief of Staff, EO and the Chairman. OSI is very conservative; the IG report described OSI management as Midwest conservatives. Most people think the CSP is an archetypal conservative management mechanism. It conducts its business in a mysterious way, occasionally promoting, reassigning, or sending someone to school. OSI has younger people than ORD. They represent a significant portion of the staff -- GS-11s and GS-12s. The younger "guys" see this as being brutally handled by the system. They think they should know what is happening -- that is a reasonable thing. Career Service Panels have become "ogres" in the minds of many. I have been involved in a recent investigation of a personnel problem in FMSAC in which this view was a major factor. There is no question that the CSP is a mysterious thing to those who do not participate in it, but whose career depends upon its deliberations. The position taken by OSI was to do something about this. Before this decision, there was secrecy in procedures; CSP rating could not be made known because it would be a breach of security. We had argument after argument on these matters. Some people wanted to tell the employee how he was rated; other did not agree. The reasons was that the ratings divorced from all the considerations in which they were made were often "terrible." (The rating system was "terrible.") In one case, a man who was a competent chemist, hardworking, wrote well, put out a lot of reports, was capable of liaison with high-level people, was rated a "D." It was done simply because he was never going to be promoted to a management slot. That was the wrong way to rate the man's competence and contribution. If you told this man that he got a "D," it would have "finished him off." Finally, I think the Division Chiefs in OSI went back and did what they thought was right to do. We had meetings in OSI on how the CSP should work. We took a few younger men and put them on the Panel so they could pass some information on how the Panel operated back to the rest of the younger analysts. These two men were selected for six months, and this was done absolutely in opposition to the wishes of the majority of the members of the CSP. Dr. Chamberlain, however, effectively insisted upon it.

Approved For Release 2006/01/03 : CIA-RDP79-00317A000100060032-9

25X1A9A

[] They were not just observers?

DR. STEVENS: They were participants; they were there. These two men were observant and handled themselves very well and did not carry back every bit of information they heard. You could get people in on the Panel that would make it difficult. When folders from their particular grade level were reviewed, their personal ratings and other information relating to them were removed. They didn't know where they stood. Personnel actions on them were taken when they were not in the meeting.

25X1A9A

[] This was probably done in Executive Session.

DR. STEVENS: Yes, it worked very well. They were told the ground rules.

25X1A9A

[] What about promotion action in their own peer group?

DR. STEVENS: They did participate in those actions. There were limitations; in OSI, a Division Chief rated his own men: A, B, C, or D. The folders were then "farmed" out to other Division Chiefs for their opinion. There was a discussion on justification of these ratings. These two appointees participated in the discussion and exchange of views, but they did not initiate any ratings. This was the only thing that limited their participation. They almost never had anything negative to say. In a general way, they participated to support someone else in personnel actions, training, policy matters, fitness reports, and all the relevant information was made available to these men. They participated in all of that. I am not asking that ORD do that, but to do so has an advantage that you don't get by bringing in Deputy Chiefs, Deputy Chiefs are part of the establishment. It may be that these things may not be a big problem in ORD, but there is some advantage in that even the Agency is trying with the MAG people to have a forum for the younger man's views.

25X1A9A

[] What about ORD having their own Management Advisory Group instead of having participation in the Panel?

DR. STEVENS: I don't think you have enough people in ORD to do this.

25X1A9A

[] I never had any feedback that ORD/CSP was mysterious.

DR. STEVENS: Maybe not. We don't have to organize the Office for the younger men. I am not trying to impose my opinion on you. If you still want the Deputy Chiefs to attend --that is fine with me.

Approved For Release 2006/01/03 : CIA-RDP79-00317A000100060032-9

Approved For Release 2006/01/03 : CIA-RDP79-00317A000100060032-9

[] Were the Deputy Chiefs in OSI allowed to join the CSP if the Division Chiefs were not there?

DR. STEVENS: No alternates were allowed at all. Also, I would like to point out that the OSI Career Service Board reached a consensus of opinion instead of taking votes.

[] CSP/ORD would need a very strong man to bring about such a consensus.

[] CSP/ORD members force the issue by voting in order to get on with the items of business.

DR. STEVENS: I'd rather hear about the arguments and know that there was disagreement rather than just get the results of a vote.

[] There is a feeling that the ORD/CSP is a "closed thing." We suggested that the Deputy Chiefs attend to give them the training so that they will know what is going on.

DR. STEVENS: Deputy Chiefs are not shut out. Don't you tell them what has happened? Don't you talk over what is happening?

[] It depends on the Division Chief.

[] Under the rules, the Division Chiefs were members and that was it.

DR. STEVENS: That is the way OSI operates, but I went back and talked to my Deputy Chief and told him what the Board had discussed.

[] Did the younger members of the Board feel they were getting attention and that the Board was solving their problems?

DR. STEVENS: I think it helped generally. It got response.

[] I think it would dissolve some of the ideas that some of the younger men have that the CSP has mystical powers.

DR. STEVENS: That is right.

[] I think younger representation would help to show that the CSP process is fairly rational and before a decision is made all sides of the question are explored.

Approved For Release 2006/01/03 : CIA-RDP79-00317A000100060032-9

[redacted] (Continued)

The CSP/ORD hasn't got anything to hide. I have had experience with TSD and NPIC Panels, and I don't think we have anything to be ashamed of in ORD. We spend a lot of time on personnel problems. I won't be embarrassed to have them sit in on the deliberations. I was against the Deputy Chiefs having the right to vote. I thought they should be observers. I would see a reason for a vote if we had younger professionals in here.

DR. STEVENS: If the vote means something it is all right. I can't remember that there ever was a vote in OSI.

[redacted] We had some trouble on problems where the Panel was split, and we needed a vote.

DR. STEVENS: There were questions that came up and were not resolved. If there was a split between two points of view and consensus could not be achieved, the minutes reflected that no one concurred, but the Chairman thought it was the right thing to do.

[redacted] ORD/CSP really serves as an advisory group to the D/ORD and have been delegated some of the responsibilities for training and on making recommendations to the D/ORD on promotion and other personnel actions. The D/ORD can overrule the CSP. The Chairman of the ORD/CSP serves as a moderator. In OSI, the Chairman established the consensus and made the position known to the Director of the Office. This is not the case here. I think the ORD/CSP operates in a more open relationship where we express our opinions and come to a certain conclusion. This result is then presented with the facts as they were and how they were sorted out. It is not appropriate for the Chairman in discussions with D/ORD on CSP deliberations to suggest that their views be disregarded. I would give the D/ORD my own opinion in my capacity of DD/ORD.

[redacted] The issue comes up. Pros and cons are discussed. The voting is a good mechanism to get it off the docket. Perhaps you want more information, Dr. Stevens, but even though it is not fully recorded in the minutes, the arguments are recorded and available.

DR. STEVENS: I would like to know what issues you do have disagreements on.

[redacted] ORD/CSP should make a rule to show dissenting factors.

DR. STEVENS: What kind of issue did you fight out?

25X1A9A

[] CSP members were sending a recommendation to D/ORD for a QSI. We had a dispute on the man's work.

25X1A9A

[] Let the D/ORD make the decision.

[] In this case, he did.

DR. STEVENS: I don't remember any case in OSI where someone came up for recognition and there was a dispute. People may have been skeptical, but there was never a decision to keep the man from getting the approval even if there was that much opposition.

25X1A9A

[] The primary justification as to voting is efficiency. As an example, in our attempts to perfect our evaluation criteria, we went through many discussions on the best method for evaluating people. We were using the rating system such as A, B, C, and D --this was not working. We looked at FMSAC's set-up and we were not too happy with it. We went through many sessions and took actions. When there was lack of consensus, we voted and this allowed us to go on to the next step of the problem. If we didn't have the voting mechanism, we would never get anywhere.

25X1A9A

[] OEL had the vote.

DR. STEVENS: I think it is time to stop "pitting" one Division against another.

25X1A9A

[] I don't think there is much of that.

25X1A9A

[] I tend to agree with [] Voting is used to get a decision and get on with the meeting. You may concur or reach a consensus, but it is not a vote.

25X1

25X1A9A

[] This Panel has never been informed or involved with the Table of Organization. We have been "in the dark" about it.

DR. STEVENS: You didn't know what the TO was?

25X1A9A

[] That was someone's decision. I never could understand how the Division Chiefs could do their career planning without this information.

25X1

25X1A9A

[] I have worked with the Division Chiefs on it, but I have never given it to them.

DR. STEVENS: We need to have our new TO approved. You should be informed on any questions that come up with the TO. Divisions should know where they stand as far as headroom is concerned. I have no problems with that. I think we are going to recognize that we must maintain some flexibility on how we use our TO.

25X1A9A

[] Double slotting should be made known.

DR. STEVENS: If the TO gets cut we have to have a means for determining what we are going to do about it. Obviously it goes beyond these questions raised by the CSP but the CSP is a mechanism that gives us the details to do a sorting out job. There is no reason why we can't be as open as we can.

25X1A9A

[] Another item up for question is appointments to Naval War College. It appears, in the past, we have had difficulty in getting people considered as candidates even after going through the screening process. If we were to identify a suitable candidate would you help us in advancing his case?

25X1A9A

[] Why don't we go through the process here first.

DR. STEVENS: I think you should. I think some of the courses are good. You should get someone in the National War College. I think the Industrial College is better than the National War College or Naval War College.

25X1A9A

[] We feel it might be to our advantage to have someone attend the Naval War College because of our interest in

25X1

25X1A9A

[] The greatest value derived from attending the Service Schools is the contacts.

DR. STEVENS: They don't tell you how to do something. They worry about management decisions and theory and talk about research.

25X1A9A

[] Along these lines, is it possible to open up overseas opportunities to ORD personnel? ORD has been handicapped by lack of overseas exposure. Could there be extended TDY assignments overseas? For example, when career planning for one individual, I specified an overseas tour of six months. There were no opportunities and, in this case, when we found something the man didn't want to go. However, we should look for opportunities such as this.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

25X1

25X1A9A

[] There might be opportunities in OEL and TSD.

DR. STEVENS: I don't know. I would guess there would be problems connected with that. OEL assignments might be useful.

25X1A9A

[] There should be more availability of assignments to other offices.

DR. STEVENS: A recommendation in the IG report suggested that something be done to make this possible. It was put squarely on the DD/S&T to do this. I will push it in TSD and OEL. We can try that. Our biggest problem in ORD is that we have no new people coming in. There are too few new younger men coming in.

25X1A9A

[] With the formation of a Projects Division, the view is that project officers would come in PD and when their project is ready to be handed over to other components they would go with it and someone else come into PD. We could get a flow of personnel through that mechanism.

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

[] then asked about [] who is in charge of the DD/S&T Development Course and what his qualifications were. Discussion followed that he was one of the first members of the course and he had been given the assignment by the DD/S&T.)

DR. STEVENS: The TO question worries me. We need to get some headroom and hire some new men. Keep some mobility - people moving through and out. ORD is one of the units that has been allowed discontinued service retirement.

25X1A9A

[] I was not aware of this, to extend beyond 21 December 1972.

DR. STEVENS: I don't think it would be amiss to talk to anybody who is interested in taking advantage of this.

25X1A9A

[] Discontinued Service Retirement can be done with 25 years of service at any age.

25X1A9A

[] (Thanked Dr. Stevens for attending the meeting and sharing an exchange of views with the CSP members. (Dr. Stevens left the meeting at 1035 hours.)

25X1

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

25X1

10. The CSP then took up the discussion on the results of the competitive evaluation and ranking of GS-9s - GS-11s.

(See Sheet Attached)

11. Discussion followed:

25X1A9A

[] The competitive evaluation on this group is totally wrong. There are no two people listed that can be honestly compared. One is a professional: [] one is a technician: [] one is a librarian: [] who is compared against a computer type and professional. I don't want any part of this evaluation. I think it is absurd.

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

[] Do we agree with the ranking?

25X1A6A

25X1A9A

[] In the IG report it was suggested that the libraries in the [] such as ORD, COMMO and OL be combined. Growth is another problem. If you would try to promote relative to [] - you eventually will have the problem of a top heavy organization. Is there any projection on headroom?

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

[] Headroom can be resolved by DD/S&T.

25X1A9A

[] is talented, but he has not been used properly. He has not had exposure. He has shown some ingenious ideas by using his talents that will pay off. He seems to be a smart employee. I would not promote him in January 1973. I want him to demonstrate to everybody that he is able to do something.

25X1A9A

[] This is the first time that our D/ORD has stated that we can use TO information in considering recommendations for promotions. Our first item of business should be to understand what the TO is and the assignment of slots. Could we ask [] to provide the CSP members with TO information so we can talk about it and know where we stand.

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

[] I have felt this way too. You need the information, but you have to recognize that adjustments have been made to accommodate on the present TO.

25X1A9A

[] Yes, we have to understand our TO.
[] I have to pick up a slot.

25X1A9A

[] The Office had to stay within the assigned grade point average in reducing its TO. A decision had to be made on where to take the points.

25X1

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2006/01/03 : CIA-RDP79-00317A000100060032-9

25X1

11. (Continued)

25X1A9A

[] At the end of each month, we receive a Position Control Register (PCR). This is an IBM run with job titles, grades, planned incumbency and total number of people on board. This is worthless at this point as the entire structure has changes as of 27 September 1972 and classification is not going to be made until after the first of the year. I have taken people and job titles and come up with the same number of grade points with the organization structure that Dr. Stevens outlined. This has not been approved. PMCD/OP will have to approve it, and then receive the approval of the Executive Director-Comptroller. Dr. Stevens is not going to act until he gets PMCD approval. PMCD will also do a desk audit.

25X1A9A

[] Do we get instructions on writing job descriptions?

25X1A9A

[] stated he would circulate procedure on writing job descriptions.)

25X1A9A

[] Please get the Grade Criteria report out and [] please check to see if it still stands up.

25X1A9A

[] instructed [] to issue copies of the PCR and the new TO that has been proposed but not approved.)

25X1A9A

[] I would like to have a representative from PMCD come over and sit down with you in order to give you something to start you off with -- give us some guidelines on job descriptions.

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

12. The CSP then considered the promotion recommendation for [] B&A Assistant, Programs Analysis Staff/ORD under the SF Career Service. [] explained that the letter of promotion was written by [], B&A Officer/ORD and taken over to the Office of Finance. He was instructed by them to return with it to ORD and present it to the D/ORD. A memorandum recommending promotion is usually written by the D/ORD or by the Chairman of the ORD/CSP, if he delegates to do so. This action is taken if the CSP feels that [] services deserve such a recommendation.

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

13. [] moved that the CSP postpone decision on the recommendation for promotion of [] from GS-9 to GS-10 until the next CSP meeting when [] would be here to present the case. [] seconded the motion. The members present concurred with the motion.

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

25X1

Approved For Release 2006/01/03 : CIA-RDP79-00317A000100060032-9

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

25X1A9A

14. [] stated that he had neglected in his report to give the members a briefing on the Special Panel Meeting held on 20 November 1973. He stated that it had been the decision of the Special Panel not to distribute the minutes but make them available to read upon request because of the very confidential nature of the matters discussed in reference to secretarial personnel. [] stated that the Special Panel meeting was illegal under the new charter. [] stated he did not agree. [] stated the Special Panel was still operating under the old Charter on 20 November 1972. The new Charter was not signed until 22 November 1972.

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

15. [] then stated that the Special Panel/ORD can be disestablished, and its work can be postponed until a decision is made by the CSP under the new Charter.

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

16. [] moved that the Special Panel be reinstated until such time as new action is taken. [] seconded the motion. It was the consensus of the Panel that this motion be carried.

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

17. [] moved that the meeting adjourn. [] seconded the motion. The members present concurred.

25X1A9A

18. Meeting was adjourned at 1120 hours.

[]
Executive Secretary
Career Service Panel/ORD

25X1A9A

APPROVED:

25X1A9A

[]
Chairman, CSP/ORD/DD/S&T

15 December 1972 (DRAFT)
Date

11 Jan 1973 (FINAL)
Date

(Minutes reviewed by Dr. Stevens - 29 December 1972)

25X1

CAREER SERVICE PANEL MEETING
11 December 1972

GS-11s

COMPETITIVE EVALUATION & RANKING
DATA

25X1A9A

--

Points
10

Ranking
1

16

2*

16

2*

PROMOTABILITY LIST

25X1A9A

--

(January 1973)

Points

7

Ranking

1

13

2

15

3

25X1A9A

--

*Tie

25X1

--